UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,232	03/25/2004	Yacl Vodovotz	22727/04211	6689
	7590 03/06/200 FER & GRISWOLD, I	EXAMINER		
800 SUPERIOR AVENUE			WEIER, ANTHONY J	
SUITE 1400 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		·	1761	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			V		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/809,232	VODOVOTZ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_		
	Anthony Weier	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MAILING I	DATE OF THIS COMMUN. 136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tte, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 l	December 2006.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 and 30-36 is/a 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 16-29 is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	re withdrawn from conside	eration.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin 11.	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyaction is required if the drawin	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	∆ \	Summan (PTO 412)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/809,232

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II (claims 16-29) in the reply filed on 12/15/06 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the search of all the inventions within class 426 and subclass 634 would not be a serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the search of each invention would extend well beyond searching a single class/subclass. Moreover, the searches for each invention are not commensurate with one another and would require different search strategies.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Some of the references submitted in the IDS filed 9/16/04 have not been considered (and have been crossed out) as same were not accompanied by the publication date for same as required under 37 CFR 1.98. In addition, one of the references "The Effect of Bread-Making on Isoflavone Content...." (Zhang et al) appears to be incomplete as the "Conclusions" section is missing or has been blocked out.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 16-18 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of Pandjaitan et al, JP 1-258669, Obata et al, Ara et al (Journal

Application/Control Number: 10/809,232

Art Unit: 1761

of the Japanese Society for Food Science and Technology article), Choi et al (Biotechnology Letters 24 article), and JP 11169127.

Pandjaitan et al (page 403) discloses a edible material comprising soy flour wherein isoflavones are changed into the aglycone form via beta-glucosidase. JP 1-258669 (e.g. Abstract), Ara et al (Abstract), Choi et al (page 2113), JP 11169127 (e.g. tofu; Abstract) and Obata et al (e.g. Abstract) also each disclose an edible material comprising soybeans wherein isoflavones are changed into the aglycone form via beta-glucosidase.

It is expected that the edible material of said references would possess betaglucosidase with the particular hydrolyzing ability as called for in the instant claims due to the similarity in material with that employed in the instant invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pandjaitan et al, JP 1-258669, Obata et al, Ara et al (Journal of the Japanese Society for Food Science and Technology article), Choi et al (Biotechnology Letters 24 article), and JP 11169127.

Pandjaitan et al is silent regarding the amount of soy protein present in each serving. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have modified the size of serving and relative amount of soy protein therein as a matter of preference.

Page 4

6. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Pandjaitan et al, JP 1-258669, Obata et al, Ara et al (Journal of the Japanese Society for Food Science and Technology article), Choi et al (Biotechnology Letters 24 article), and JP 11169127 taken together with Kosuna et al.

The references do not appear to comprise any almond. However, such is a well known source of beta-glucosidase as taught, for example, by Kosuna et al (e.g. paragraph 58) and it would have been obvious to have employed beta-glucosidase via almond as a matter of convenience (rather than extracting same). It would have been further obvious to have arrived at the amount of almond in the edible material as a matter of preference depending on, for example, the degree of beta-glucosidase activity desired in the product.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Weier whose telephone number is 571-272-1409. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Weier February 27, 2007 Anthony Weier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761